

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
SOUTHERN DIVISION
No. 7:25-CV-1136-D

TAMER K. ABU SHAMLA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANGELICA ALFONSO-ROYALS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On June 13, 2025, Tamer K. Abu Shamla (“Abu Shamla” or “plaintiff”), appearing pro se, filed a complaint against Angelica Alfonso-Royals, Kristi Noem, in her official capacity as the United States Secretary of Homeland Security, and The Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (collectively, “defendants”) [D.E. 1] and a motion to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 2]. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the court referred the matter to United States Magistrate Judge Robert B. Jones, Jr., for a memorandum and recommendation on Abu Shamla’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis and for frivolity review [D.E. 6]. On July 7, 2025, Magistrate Judge Jones issued a memorandum and recommendation (“M&R”) [D.E. 7]. In the M&R, Magistrate Judge Jones recommended that the court dismiss Abu Shamla’s complaint and deny as moot the motion to proceed in forma pauperis. See id. at 1. On July 16, 2025, Abu Shamla timely objected to the M&R [D.E. 8].


“The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (cleaned up); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error.

on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted).

The court has reviewed the M&R and Abu Shamla’s objections. Magistrate Judge Jones recommended that the court dismiss Abu Shamla’s complaint and deny the motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Abu Shamla’s “objections” to the M&R are nearly incomprehensible and largely nonresponsive to the M&R. See [D.E. 8] 2–9. In any event, the court has reviewed Abu Shamla’s complaint, the record, and the M&R de novo. The court agrees with Magistrate Judge Jones’s recommendations, overrules Abu Shamla’s objections, and adopts the conclusions in the M&R.

In sum, the court DENIES plaintiff’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 2], OVERRULES plaintiff’s objections to the M&R [D.E. 8], ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 7], and DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE plaintiff’s complaint [D.E. 1]. The clerk SHALL close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 21 day of July, 2025.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge